

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 - 65 are pending.

Claims 59 - 66 were cited for being mis-numbered. The claims have been amended accordingly to correct the claim numbering. Claims 59 - 66 have been renumbered as 58 - 65. Dependencies have been amended accordingly.

The specification was cited for using trademarks. It was noted that trademarks should be capitalized. The specification has been amended accordingly.

Various drawing objections were raised in connection with reference numerals and figure references. The specification has been amended to correct the drawing objections. The drawing has been amended to delete reference numerals not discussed in the specification. As to the reference numeral 200, the specification has been amended to include "200" in the text pertaining to the printing of indicia (see the paragraph beginning on line 6 of page 13).

The specification was objected to for various informalities. In response, informalities identified during a review of the specification have been corrected.

Claims 13-22 and 32-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 alleging the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 13 and 32 have been amended accordingly.

Claims 1-29, 31-39, 40-63, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being clearly anticipated by Shah et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,822,738.

Claims 30, 40, & 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being obvious in view of Shah et al.

As to the application data appearing in lines 12 - 30 on page 1 as originally filed, these lines have been canceled in a preliminary amendment mailed March 28, 2001.

As to the application data appearing in lines 24 - 28 of page 2, these lines were replaced in the March 24 preliminary amendment. The amendment made to lines 24 - 28 of page 2 are hereby rescinded in favor of the amendment made hereinabove.

Counsel for Applicant is appreciative of the opportunity to discuss, in a telephonic interview on November 13, 2003 with the Examiner, clarifications to the Section 102 rejection of

the claims. In accordance with the telephone discussion, independent claims 1, 13, 23, 32, 42, and 56 have been amended to distinguish Shat et al.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1 for example, includes a first server and a second server configured as a web server. Clients accessing the first server obtain postage from the second server (web server), by way of the first server, information for printing an indicium. Shah et al. do not show a second server configured as a web server for providing such indicia to a first server, and then to a client. Instead, Shah et al. clearly show an SMD 130 (Fig. 1) in communication with a user system (GCP 20). The GCP does not access the SMD via a first server or a second server that is configured as a web server. For at least this reason, the Section 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

As to the Section 103 rejection, the rejected claims are dependent claims. Since their respective base claims are believed to be distinguished over Shah et al. and thus in allowable condition, the Section 103 rejected dependent claims are believed to be allowable as well.

### CONCLUSION

The pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



George B.F. Yee  
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
GBFY:cmm  
60039331 v1